

Board of Zoning & Appeals
MINUTES
(Via Tele-Conference)
July 1, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Kester, Ede Graves, Sandra Quinn, & Johnny Wilson

MEMBERS ABSENT: James Dozier & Brenda Bessinger

OTHERS PRESENT: Matthew Millwood & Debra Grant

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Roll Call** (Board Secretary)
- III. Public Hearing: None**
- IV. Approval of Minutes for June 3, 2020;** Ms. Graves made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Ms. Quinn; the motion carried 4 to 0 by a roll call vote.
- V. Variance Request**

V#20-07 **Scott & Rhonda Sawyer**, property owners of 614 Prince Street (TMS# 05-0030-169-00-00), are requesting a variance to Article VIII (setbacks) of the City of Georgetown Zoning Ordinance. **Matt Millwood/City Staff** told the Board that the Sawyers would like to construct an addition on the rear of their historic home and a kitchen house, because both buildings are on the property line currently, they would like to get a variance to be able to accomplish this. The addition will be approximately 2 ft. 4 inches coming out from the rear of the main house, and they would like to add to the porch of the kitchen house and that will also require a variance, therefore a 5 ft. variance is being requested. **Mr. Sebastian Von Marschall/Representative of Beau Clowney Architects** said the additions will be done with sensitivity and in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The bump out that will be constructed will be 2 ft. 4 inches to the rear of the house. The kitchen house will have an addition in the rear; a shed roof. Mr. Von Marschall said they have received the approvals from ARB. **Mr. Kester** said he and Matt Millwood had discussed a zero side property line variance might be appropriate because both structures are on the property line currently. **Ms. Graves** asked if the kitchen house was viewed as an accessory structure. **Matt Millwood/City Staff** said yes the kitchen house is considered an accessory structure because it is not attached to the main house and if the owners wanted to add another accessory building they would have to get a variance.

Motion: Ms. Graves made a motion to approve the variance request, allowing a zero lot line variance for the left side setback, since the main house and the kitchen house are currently on the side property line, seconded by Mr. Wilson; the motion carried 4 to 0 by a roll call vote.

V#20-08 **Mrs. Jean Rothrock**, property owner of 422 Front Street (TMS #05-0032-017-00-00), is requesting a variance to Article IV, Section 5 (mechanical unit freeboard) from the City of Georgetown Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. **Matt Millwood/City Staff** said there were a few phone call on the matter, the neighbors were asking what the variance was and some had concerns about the height of the generator on the front of the

property and asked if it was going to be screened. The variance request is to the City required freeboard; which is the additional 2 ft. required by the City in addition to the FEMA flood zone requirements, which is extra protection during storms. The addition to the home did meet the freeboard requirements, however the mechanical units does not. The Rothrock property does slop to the back and that is why the units were placed in the front on a 2 ½ ft. platform; a 1.7 ft. variance is needed. Ms. Rothrock will install landscaping around the new addition that should screen the units. The surrounding neighbors did mention the height of the generator and if it is moved up higher it will be very visible and it may be a distraction of the site lines and take away from the character of the historic district. **Mr. Kester** said his concern is that if a hurricane or a storm comes and the generator gets water in it, it will not work. Mr. Kester also said the Wilcox house needed a variance for the same situation. **Matt Millwood** said the mechanical units were put in before the second elevation certificate was received, the units were listed; however Matt said he thought it was the existing units that was shown. This was missed by him and the inspector didn't mention the new unit. After the final elevation certificate was received and it was discovered that new units were put in and they did not meet the freeboard requirements, then the home owner and the mechanical contractor were contacted. The owner was very concerned because she said it would cost quite a bit to have the units removed and reinstalled. This is the reason this is being brought before this board, to get a variance on the freeboard. **Mr. Kester** said even though this would cost something to have the units elevated, however it would not be as expensive as the owners think. **Matt** said he just wanted to remind the Board that the complaints and concerns of this project was because of the height of the generator and raising it would only make matters worse. **Mr. Kester** asked if the owner was going to plant scrubs to screen the area. **Matt** said yes the plans submitted did show a landscape plan (*Matt read off the types of plants that was listed*). **Ms. Graves** said she feels certain that Ms. Rothrock doesn't want to see the generator in the front of the home and is sure she will screen it. The owners did go before ARB to get the approval and if it is a problem with the screening it should be an ARB issue. Ms. Graves also said because this was not caught by the City staff, and for them to now ask the owners to raise it up, it would be unfair, also the Wilcox was approved for this, so the only thing that can be done now is to allow it to remain in place.

Motion: Ms. Quinn made a motion to approve the variance to allow the mechanical units to remain in place, seconded by Ms. Graves; the motion carried 4 to 0 by a roll call vote. (Mr. Kester asked that contractors be notified in advance of the City freeboard requirements)

VI. Discussion: None

VII. Adjournment: With there being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Submitted By,

*Debra Grant
Board Secretary*